

Appl. No. 10/659,100  
Docket No. 9031  
Amdt. Dated September 24, 2010  
Reply to Office Action mailed on June 24, 2010  
Customer No. 27752

## REMARKS

### Claim Status

Claims 7-10 and 19-27 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 19 and 23 are amended herein. Support for the amendment to claims 19 and 23 can be found, for example, at paragraph 22 of the published specification.

Claims 28, 30, 31, 33, and 34 are cancelled herein without prejudice.

It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

### Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Leaderman

The Office Action stated that claims 8-10, 19, 20, 22, 28-31, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Leaderman (US 2002/0061329) (Leaderman). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration respectfully requested.

Applicants submit the office action has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness as it relates to amended independent claim 19 and those claims dependent thereon as it does not address all of the limitations of amended claim 19. For example, the office action fails to address the limitation of the void spaces being from about 1  $\mu\text{m}$  to about 50 $\mu\text{m}$  wide. As such, Applicants submit claim 19 and those claims dependent thereon are free from the art as cited and respectfully request reconsideration.

### Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Jones

Appl. No. 10/659,100  
Docket No. 9031  
Amdt. Dated September 24, 2010  
Reply to Office Action mailed on June 24, 2010  
Customer No. 27752

The Office Action stated that claims 10, 19, 20, 22, 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Jones et al (US 2005/0260544) (Jones). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration respectfully requested.

Applicants submit the office action has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness as it relates to amended independent claim 19 and those claims dependent thereon as it does not address all of the limitations of amended claim 19. For example, the office action fails to address the limitation of the void spaces being from about 1  $\mu\text{m}$  to about 50 $\mu\text{m}$  wide. As such, Applicants submit claim 19 and those claims dependent thereon are free from the art as cited and respectfully request reconsideration.

#### Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Jones In View of Ruben

The Office Action stated that claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Jones in view of Ruben (US 6,146,655) (Ruben). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration respectfully requested.

As stated above, Applicants submit the office action has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness as it relates to amended independent claim 19, from which claim 7 depends. As such, Applicants submit claim 7 is likewise free from the art as cited and respectfully request reconsideration.

#### Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over Jones In View of Chen

The Office Action stated that claims 21, 23-27, and 33 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) over Jones in view of Chen et al. (US 6,261,679) (Chen). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration respectfully requested.

Applicants submit the office action has failed to state a *prima facie* case of obviousness as it relates to amended independent claims 19, 23, and those claims dependent thereon as it does not

Appl. No. 10/659,100  
Docket No. 9031  
Amdt. Dated September 24, 2010  
Reply to Office Action mailed on June 24, 2010  
Customer No. 27752

address all of the limitations of amended claims 19 and 23. For example, the office action fails to address the limitation of the void spaces being from about 1  $\mu\text{m}$  to about 50 $\mu\text{m}$  wide. As such, Applicants submit claims 19, 23, and those claims dependent thereon are free from the art as cited and respectfully request reconsideration.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

Date: September 24, 2010  
Customer No. 27752

By /Carrie M. Benjamin/  
Carrie M. Benjamin  
Registration No. 58,861  
(513) 983-3449